



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,948	07/08/2003	John J. McSheffrey	04373-033001	7119
26161 7590 10/21/2008 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, DINH Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3752				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/21/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/614,948

**Applicant(s)**

MCSHEFFREY ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dinh Q. Nguyen

**Art Unit**

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1.6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 39-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1.6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 39-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.

Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teach all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

With respect to claim 8, to have the detection range of 6 inches to 10 feet is obvious with one skilled in the art and furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either claimed

dimensions or the Morgan et al., Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant dimensions.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the device of Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

3. Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant.

Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Cronin et al. and Nishimoto et al. with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

4. Claims 9, 10, 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Rockwell et al.

Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant teach all the limitations of the claims except for the communication between two emergency

equipment stations. However, Rockwell discloses an emergency equipment station with wireless communications that is capable with point-to-point communication with another emergency equipment station (see column 11, lines 25+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al., Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant with the communication between two emergency equipment stations as suggested by Rockwell. Doing so would provide a convenience and effective emergency equipment station (see column 5, lines 2-57).

5. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 18-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 above, and further in view of Cronin et al.
6. Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a detector for a low battery condition. However, Cronin et al. discloses an emergency equipment station 10 having a portable defibrillator, one or more batteries with a low battery detector 18/19 (see column 4, lines 29-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al., Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant with the communication between two emergency equipment stations as suggested by Cronin et al. Doing so would provide a convenience and effective emergency equipment station.
7. Claims 36, 37, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Morgan et al.

Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant teaches all the limitations of the claims except for a wireless or a hardwire communication. However, Morgan et al. discloses an emergency equipment station with wireless or hardwire communication capabilities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Cronin et al., Nishimoto et al., Deavila and Avant with a wireless or a hardwire communication as suggested by Morgan et al. Doing so would provide a versatile emergency equipment station (see column 1, lines 25-40).

### ***Double Patenting***

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37, 39-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 7,271,704 in view of Deavila and Avant.

Claims 1, 21, and 25 of the '704 patent teach all the limitations of the claims. Claims 1, 21 and 25 of the '704 patent do not teach a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge. However, Deavila discloses an emergency station 20 having a portable fire extinguisher 102, a portable defibrillator located compartments 94c and 94d (see page 4, paragraph 0056). Avant discloses a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge 80 for detecting and displaying pressure condition within a volume of a tank 2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of the '704 patent with a fire extinguisher station having a portable fire extinguisher and a pressure gauge as suggested by Deavila and Avant respectively. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station

#### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed April 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Morgan et al. reference discloses a defibrillator with can issue a signal using an electronic circuit (computer with a modem) to a remote central station, thus the Morgan in combination with Nishimoto reference (for teaching of a sonar module) and Avant reference (for teaching of a portable fire extinguisher with a pressure gauge) capable of issuing a signal to a remote central station upon detection of one or more predetermined conditions and the combination of the references is obvious for one

skilled in the art. The Examiner maintaining the nonstatutory double patenting rejection since no terminal disclaimer has been filed.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dinh Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4907. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on 571-272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dinh Q Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752

dqn